## 

## PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

12B5 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019-6064

TELEPHONE (212) 373-3000

LLOYD K. GARRISON (1948-1991) RANDOLPH E. PAUL (1948-1986) SIMON H. RIFKIND (1920-1988) LOUIS S. WEISS (1927-1980) JOHN S. WHARTON (1927-1977)

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

(212) 373-3553

WRITER'S DIRECT FACSIMILE

(212) 492-0553

WRITER'S DIRECT E-MAIL ADDRESS

sbuergel@paulweiss.com

May 15, 2023

unit 5201, fortune financial center 5 donoganhuan zhonolu Chaqyang district, Beijing 100020, China Telephone (86-10) 5528-3300

> SUITES 3601 - 3606 & 3610 3645, GLOUCESTER TOWER THE LANDMARK IS QUEEN'S ROAD, CENTRAL HONG KONG TELEPHONE (852) 2846-0300

ALDER CASTLE
IO NOBLE STREET
LONDON EC2Y 7JU. UNITED KINGDOM
TELEPHONE (44 20) 7367 1600

Fukoku seimei building 2-z uchibaiwaicho 2-chome Chiyoda-ku, tokyo 100-0011, Japan Telephone (81-9) 3597-8101

TORONTO-DOMINION CENTRE 77 KING STREET WEST, SUITE 3100 PO. BOX 225 TORONTO, ONTARIO MSK 1J3 TELEPHONE (416) 504-0520

2001 K STREST, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1047 YELEPHONE (202) 223-7300

500 delaware avenue, suite 200 Post office box 32 Wilmington, de 19099-0032 Telephone (302) 555-4410 MATTHEW W. ABBOTT
GOWARD T. ACKERMAN
JACOB A. ADLERSTEIN
JACOB A. ATKINS
GOOTT A. BARSHAY
FAUL M. BASTA
JONATHAN H. ASHTOR
ROBERT A. ATKINS
GOOTT A. BARSHAY
FAUL M. BENSON
JOSEPH J. BIAL
BRIVE BROWN
JOSEPH J. BIAL
ANGEL BONNING
BRILLE BONNING
BRILLE BONNING
ANGEL BONNING
BRILLE BROWN
WALTER BROWN
WALTER
BROWN
WALTER BROWN
WALTER
WAL

ARM MADY WAN THE OT DESTRINGS TOUR.

DANIEL J. KRAMER
BRIAN KRAUSE
CAJTH KUSHNER
DAVID K. LAKHOHR
GREGORY F. LAUFER
BRIAN C. LAW IN
LORETTA E. LYNCH
JEFFREY D. MARELL
MARCO V. MASOTTI
DAVID W MAYO
EERABE TO. LOUGHLIN
ALVARO MEMBRILLERA
MAKK F. MENDELSOHN
CLAUDINE MEREDITH-GOUJON
WILLIAM B. MICHAEL

JAME B. O'BRIEN
BRAD R. OKUN
LINDSAY B. FARKS
ANDREW M. PARLEN
DANIELLE C. PENHALL
LINDSAY B. FARKS
ANDREW M. PARLEN
DANIELLE C. PENHALL
LESSICA E. PHILLIPS
ALBTIN FOLLET\*
VALERIE E. RADWANER
JEFFREY J. RECHER
CARL R. REGISTER
LEANINE S. RHEE\*
WALVER G. RICCIARD
RICHARD A. ROSEN
BLOWNIE S. RHEE\*
WALVER G. RICCIARD
RICHARD A. ROSEN
LINDSEY B. SAMUELS
RAPHAEL M. RUSSO
ELIZABETH M. SACKSTEDER
JEFFREY D. SAFERSTEIN
JEFFREY B. SAMUELS
RAPHAEL M. RUSSO
CELIZABETH M. SCCHTELDER
JEFFREY B. SAMUELS
RANDON K. SHANMUGAM\*
COULEN L. SINCLAM
ANDREW
AND

Via ECF

Hon. Paul A. Engelmayer, United States District Judge United States District Court Southern District of New York 500 Pearl Street New York, NY 10007

Re: In re: Morgan Stanley Data Security Litigation, 1:20-cv-5914 (PAE)

Dear Judge Engelmayer:

We represent Morgan Stanley Smith Barney LLC in connection with the above-referenced matter. We write jointly with Settlement Class Counsel, Nussbaum Law Group and Morgan & Morgan. Pursuant to Rule 4.B of this Court's Individual Rules and Practices in Civil Cases, and consistent with the letter motion filed February 15, 2023 (ECF

No. 203), the March 14, 2023 Letter submitted to this Court (ECF No. 208), and as we discussed on the record during the August 5, 2022 settlement approval hearing, we respectfully request leave to publicly file a redacted copy of the second quarterly status update report of the work completed to date by Kroll, Inc. (the "Second Kroll Report"), given the sensitive personal and confidential information contained therein.

In the Second Circuit, there exists a rebuttable presumption of public access for any "judicial documents" filed with the court. Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga. 435 F.3d 110 (2d Cir. 2006). Simply because a paper is filed with the court does not make it a "judicial document," but rather the document must be "relevant to the performance of the judicial function" or useful in the judicial process. Id. at 119. Where a document is found to be a judicial document, but is not necessary for some kind of dispositive determination, the standard to rebut that presumption of public access and to sustain redactions is lower. See Kewazinga Corp. v. Microsoft Corp., 2021 WL 1222122, at \*5 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2021). Two of the kinds of values that may justify the sealing or redaction of documents include protecting privacy interests of third parties or other sensitive information such as proprietary commercial information. See Church & Dwight Co. v. SPD Swiss Precision Diagnostics GmbH, 2018 WL 4253181, at \*2 n.1 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 5, 2018) (finding proposed redactions in post-trial submissions appropriate when narrowly tailored to protect proprietary and competitively sensitive information, including information that the parties were contractually obligated to keep confidential); E.E.O.C. v. Kelley Drye & Warren LLP, 2012 WL 691545, at \*2 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 2, 2012) (noting acceptable justifications for redactions include privacy interests of innocent third parties); Standard & Poor's Corp. v. Commodity Exch., Inc., 541 F. Supp. 1273, 1277 (S.D.N.Y.

3

1982) (finding limited redactions justified where redactions were tailored to protecting

party's commercial information, including index-rendering methodology, and in order to

avoid potential harassment or disruptions that could prevent the relevant analysts from

performing their jobs properly).

Here, the Second Kroll Report is not a submission in support of a dispositive

motion, for which the most conservative approach would be warranted. As a result, the

report is a judicial document subject to a lower presumption of public access. Nonetheless,

the Second Kroll Report is "relevant to the performance of the judicial function": the Court

ordered the parties to submit quarterly reports to ensure compliance with the settlement

agreement. With that purpose in mind, the parties endeavored to narrowly tailor their

redactions to the Second Kroll Report so that Settlement Class Members who may review

the publicly available version can generally understand the steps that Kroll has undertaken

to recover decommissioned devices and the success of those efforts.

Specifically, the redactions obscure the details regarding Kroll's

communications with certain downstream purchasers of the decommissioned drives at

issue, which includes the personal identifiable information ("PII") of those downstream

purchasers. The redactions are intended to both shield the privacy of the downstream

purchasers and avoid sharing information that could potentially assist a malicious actor in

finding and acquiring NetApp devices before Kroll is able to locate them.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Susanna M. Buergel

Susanna M. Buergel

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

Jane Baek O'Brien Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, LLP

Counsel for Defendant Morgan Stanley Smith Barney LLC 4

/s/ Linda P. Nussbaum

Linda P. Nussbaum Nussbaum Law Group, P.C.

/s/ Jean Martin

Jean Martin Morgan & Morgan

Settlement Class Counsel

cc: All counsel of record

The Court finds that the redactions are no greater than necessary to protect the purchasers' privacy interests and Kroll's proprietary commercial practices and, accordingly, approves the filing of the redacted report. SO ORDERED.

PAUL A. ENGELMAYER United States District Judge

May 17, 2023